



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/762,523

01/23/2004

Byung-rae Lee

Q79369

5359

23373 7590 10/30/2007
SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W.
SUITE 800
WASHINGTON, DC 20037

EXAMINER

PATEL, NIRAV B

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2135

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

10/30/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

Handwritten mark

APPLICATION NO./ CONTROL NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR / PATENT IN REEXAMINATION	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
10762523	1/23/2004	LEE ET AL.	Q79369

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W.
SUITE 800
WASHINGTON, DC 20037

EXAMINER

Nirav Patel

ART UNIT	PAPER
----------	-------

2135

20071011

DATE MAILED:

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner for Patents

Examiner acknowledges the deficiencies associated with claim 29 in the office action dated on 10/15/07 as pointed out by Applicant's representative Ms. Uy. As the result, a new office action has been issued in regard to deficiency associated with claim 29, which encompasses limitations that are similar to limitations of claim 5 and is rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 5. The statutory shortened period set in the office action is reset to start by the mailing date of this communication.

Attachment(s)
1) office action
2) PTO-413

DETAILED ACTION

1. Applicant's amendment filed on Aug. 01, 2007 has been entered. Claims 1-33 are pending.

2. The Office would like to notify the Applicant that there has been a change in Examiner to conduct the future examination and prosecution processes of the currently pending application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claim 1, 8, 17 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Tso et al (US Patent No. 6,421,733).

As per claim 1, Tso discloses:

a server operable to convert multimedia contents received through the Internet into multimedia contents having a format suitable for at least one client of the intranet and transmitting the converted multimedia contents to the client [Fig. 3, 5 col. col. 10 lines 47-49].

Art Unit: 2135

As per claim 8, it encompasses limitations that are similar to limitations of claim 1. Thus, it is rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 1 above.

As per claim 17, it encompasses limitations that are similar to limitations of claim 1. Thus, it is rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 1 above.

As per claim 24, it encompasses limitations that are similar to limitations of claim 1. Thus, it is rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 1 above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 2-4, 9-11, 18-20 and 25-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tso et al (US Patent No. 6,421,733) and in view of Russ et al (US Patent No. 6,748,080).

As per claim 2, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and Tso teaches the converted multimedia contents are compressed [col. 8 lines 25-26].

Art Unit: 2135

However, Russ teaches the converted multimedia contents are encrypted and transmitted to the client [Fig. 3, col. 16 lines 9-13, 64-67, col. 17 lines 1-7].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Russ with Tso, since one would have been motivated to provide security and control concerns for the operators of the subscriber network system [Russ, col. 2 lines 11-13].

As per claim 3, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and Russ teaches:

the server translates a license received through the Internet to be suitable for the client of the intranet and additionally transmits the translated license to the client [Fig. 3, 7, col. 21 lines 21-65].

As per claim 4, the rejection of claim 3 is incorporated and Russ teaches:

the translated license is encrypted and transmitted to the client [Fig. 3, 7, col. 21 lines 21-65].

As per claim 9, the rejection of claim 8 is incorporated and it encompasses limitations that are similar to limitations of claim 2. Thus, it is rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 2 above.

Art Unit: 2135

As per claim 10, the rejection of claim 9 is incorporated and it encompasses limitations that are similar to limitations of claim 3. Thus, it is rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 3 above.

As per claim 11, the rejection of claim 10 is incorporated and it encompasses limitations that are similar to limitations of claim 4. Thus, it is rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 4 above.

As per claim 18, the rejection of claim 17 is incorporated and it encompasses limitations that are similar to limitations of claim 2. Thus, it is rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 2 above.

As per claim 19, the rejection of claim 17 is incorporated and it encompasses limitations that are similar to limitations of claim 3. Thus, it is rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 3 above.

As per claim 20, the rejection of claim 19 is incorporated and it encompasses limitations that are similar to limitations of claim 4. Thus, it is rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 4 above.

As per claim 25, the rejection of claim 24 is incorporated and it encompasses limitations that are similar to limitations of claim 2. Thus, it is rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 2 above.

As per claim 26, the rejection of claim 25 is incorporated and it encompasses limitations that are similar to limitations of claim 3. Thus, it is rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 3 above.

As per claim 27, the rejection of claim 26 is incorporated and it encompasses limitations that are similar to limitations of claim 4. Thus, it is rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 4 above.

5. Claims 5 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tso et al (US Patent No. 6,421,733) in view of Russ et al (US Patent No. 6,748,080) and in view of Fransdonk (US Patent No. 7,228,427).

As per claim 5, the rejection of claim 2 or 4 is incorporated and Russ teaches the encryption is performed using a key [col. 20 lines 11-20].

Fransdonk teaches the encryption is performed using a group key of the server [Fig. 2, col. 17 lines 49-50].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Fransdonk with Tso and Russ, since one would

Art Unit: 2135

have been motivated to distribute and deliver the content via a communication network securely [Fransdonk, col. 1 lines 30-32].

As per claim 21, the rejection of claim 18 or 20 is incorporated and it encompasses limitations that are similar to limitations of claim 5. Thus, it is rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 5 above.

6. Claims 6, 7, 12, 16, 22, 23, 28 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tso et al (US Patent No. 6,421,733) in view of Russ et al (US Patent No. 6,748,080) and in view of Hans et al (US Patent No. 7,200,575).

As per claim 6, the rejection of claim 3 is incorporated and Russ teaches:

request a license for multimedia contents from a corresponding DRM server group which provides the multimedia contents [Fig. 1, col. 10 lines 48-50]; a content conversion unit operable to decrypt multimedia contents received from the corresponding DRM server group, and converting the decrypted multimedia contents into multimedia contents having a format suitable for the client; and a license translation unit operable to translate a license received from the corresponding DRM server group into a license having a format suitable for the client [col. 3, 7, col. 15, lines 34-44, col. 21 lines 21-65].

Hans teaches:

Art Unit: 2135

the server comprises a plurality of proxy managers constructed according to DRM server groups [Fig. 1-3], and performing registration of the client [Fig. 4 col. 5 lines 60-67].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Hans with Tso and Russ, since one would have been motivated to manage the access to the digital content and control the distribution of digital content [col. 1 lines 6-7, 48-49].

As per claim 7, the rejection of claim 3 is incorporated and Hans teaches:

a report/billing unit operable to arrange multimedia content usage details of the client, and to transmit the arranged multimedia content usage details to the DRM server group, and to transmit information relating to billing [Fig. 3, 4, 5].

As per claim 12, the rejection of claim 11 is incorporated and Russ teaches:

a content decryption unit operable to decrypt the multimedia contents which are encrypted and transmitted; and a rights management unit operable to decrypt the license which is encrypted and transmitted, and to check whether the decrypted multimedia contents are executed in the client to be suitable for the decrypted license [Fig. 9 col. 16-67].

Hans teaches:

an authentication and access control unit operable to perform registration of the client on the server and access to the server [Fig. 4, 5].

As per claim 16, the rejection of claim 12 is incorporated and Hans teaches:

a report unit for reporting usage details of the transmitted multimedia contents to the server [Fig. 3-5].

As per claim 22, the rejection of claim 17 is incorporated and it encompasses limitations that are similar to limitations of claim 7. Thus, it is rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 7 above.

As per claim 23, the rejection of claim 22 is incorporated and it encompasses limitations that are similar to limitations of claim 7. Thus, it is rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 7 above.

As per claim 28, the rejection of claim 27 is incorporated and it encompasses limitations that are similar to limitations of claim 12. Thus, it is rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 12 above.

As per claim 32, the rejection of claim 28 is incorporated and it encompasses limitations that are similar to limitations of claim 16. Thus, it is rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 16 above.

Art Unit: 2135

7. Claims 13-15 and 29-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tso et al (US Patent No. 6,421,733) in view of Russ et al (US Patent No. 6,748,080) in view of Hans et al (US Patent No. 7,200,575) and in view of Fransdonk (US Patent No. 7,228,427).

As per claim 13, the rejection of claim 12 is incorporated and Russ teaches the encryption is performed using a key [col. 20 lines 11-20].

Fransdonk teaches the encryption is performed using a group key of the server [Fig. 2, col. 17 lines 49-50].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Fransdonk with Tso, Russ and Hands, since one would have been motivated to distribute and deliver the content via a communication network securely [Fransdonk, col. 1 lines 30-32].

As per claim 14, the rejection of claim 12 is incorporated and it encompasses limitations that are similar to limitations of claim 13. Thus, it is rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 13 above.

As per claim 15, the rejection of claim 13 or 14 is incorporated and Fransdonk teaches the decryption is performed using a client key corresponding to the group key of the server [Fig. 2, col. 17 lines 49-50].

Art Unit: 2135

As per claim 29, the rejection of claim 28 is incorporated and Russ teaches the encryption is performed using a key [col. 20 lines 11-20].

Fransdonk teaches the encryption is performed using a group key of the server [Fig. 2, col. 17 lines 49-50].

As per claim 30, the rejection of claim 28 is incorporated and it encompasses limitations that are similar to limitations of claim 14. Thus, it is rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 14 above.

As per claim 31, the rejection of claim 29 or 30 is incorporated and it encompasses limitations that are similar to limitations of claim 15. Thus, it is rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 15 above.

As per claim 33, the rejection of claim 15 is incorporated and Hans teaches said client key is assigned to register DRM smart clients through the platform authentication and access control unit [Fig. 3, 5].

Response to Amendment

8. Applicant's amendment filed on Aug. 01, 2007 has been fully considered and is persuasive. Therefore, previous rejection has been withdrawn. See a new ground(s) of rejection above.

Conclusion

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure (see form 892).


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nirav Patel whose telephone number is 571-272-5936. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 am - 4:30 pm (M-F).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kim Vu can be reached on 571-272-3859. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

NBP

10/25/07


KIM VU
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100